

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**Minutes of the Meeting of March 17, 2014**

*Boulder Campus Items*

The University Design Review Board met on Monday, March 17, 2014, in the north room of the Stadium Club at Folsom Field on the Boulder Campus.

DRB members present were: Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgay, and Candy Roberts. Also present was Teresa Osborne, Office of Budget and Finance. CU-Boulder staff members present were: Tom Goodhew, Bill Haverly, Richelle Reilly, Phil Simpson, and William Arndt of Facilities Management.

**GROUNDS BUILDING / INTERMEDIATE PROCESSING CENTER (IPC) RELOCATION**

Also present for the discussion were: Jason Messares, BHA Design Inc.; Sean Convery, Cator Ruma & Associates; Mark Thombrough, Martin/Martin Engineering; Henry Ehrgott, Whiting-Turner Contracting Co.; Ed von Bleichert, CU Environmental Operations; Marina Florian, CU Facilities Management; and Eric Cameron, Ryan Heliand, and Don Inglis, CU Outdoor Services.

Goodhew explained that the Grounds Building, which includes the Intermediate Processing Center (IPC), needs to be relocated to accommodate expansion of facilities at Folsom Field. The site, approved in the Campus Master Plan, is east of the Regent AutoPark, replacing a surface parking lot. There is an earthen berm at the east side of the site, partially blocking the site from 28th Street. A major path which leads to the pedestrian underpass at 28th Street borders the site on the north. This path has up to 500 people per hour at peak times.

Ehrgott talked about the site, massing of the proposed structures, and architectural textures. Convery presented drawings that were prepared as part of their interview for the project. There are three components: an office building for Grounds Operations, an outdoor yard for Grounds, and the IPC itself. The drawings showed three configurations of these components, laid north and south on the site. He said that the design team prefers the third option, with the IPC at the north, the Grounds facility in the middle, and the Grounds yard on the south. As the IPC needs two-stories with truck access to the upper level, the topography seems to best support this scheme.

Roberts asked for more detail about the IPC process and the need for two levels. She was concerned about screening from the east and north. Convery explained that the recyclables enter at the second floor then go through steel grating into dumpsters on the first floor. Sorting is done on conveyer belts and the material is removed by truck from the lower level. He noted that there are over 60 student employees.

The Grounds division maintains lawns, irrigation, and winter snow removal for most of the main campus. Some of the access for smaller equipment (mowers, golf carts) could be from the north, over the sidewalk. Inglis noted that it is standard policy for all Grounds and Facilities vehicles to stop and/or move aside during class change periods. Limited fire access needs to be accommodated at the north as well.

Roberts asked about site restrains and schedule. Convery said that Scheme 3 works best in terms of circulation and truck turning space. There is a berm on the east that will provide some screening. He noted that CU maintains the multi-use path that the City built along 29th Street, so access points would be needed for it.

Inglis elaborated on the vehicular needs of Outdoor Services. The turf group uses mowers and golf carts, with snow plows in the winter. Large plows are housed on the East Campus. Irrigation Services has pick-up trucks and uses some satellite locations. They need to move materials like mulch and ice melt. The Grounds yard would contain mulch, soil, ¾" rock, signage, and piping. The entire department responds to seasonal changes.

Olgyay asked about circulation. Von Bleichert said that the turn radius for larger trucks would make a north entry to the site difficult. There are other large trucks that use the adjacent Environmental Health and Safety Center loading docks. He said that the first outdoor trash removal shift goes from 4:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. There are twelve vehicles and two large 20-ton trucks as well as two rear loaders. These trucks need roll-off access. He also noted that the current Grounds yard has a gas pump that is used by other campus vehicles which requires large gas trucks to fill the underground tank a couple of times a year.

Brandes asked about the current site. Inglis said it is already too small. Eventually, more space may be needed on the East Campus. Simpson said that expansion on to the new campus would augment, but not replace the site now being proposed. Brandes asked how quickly the technology of the IPC was changing. Von Bleichert said that it would be nice to have expansion space in the Grounds Building, possibly including shell space being built as part of this project. Brandes asked the team to bring studies next time that show a large context, including street-level views. The site plans should be widened to include the new gateway features at 29th and Colorado, the retention ponds, all pedestrian paths, and access from Regent Drive. He also asked for cross sections showing elevations and building heights in context with the Euclid AutoPark and the EH+S Center. He requested more information about site security.

Roberts agreed with the need for more analysis of adjacencies. She also asked about the possibility of more trees and plantscape as screening, rather than walls and fences. Epstein asked for more detail about the "people spaces" in the new buildings – location and appearance of the front door, offices, break spaces, etc. Inglis noted that there are frequent public tours and open houses highlighting the recycling operations. Roberts asked about the building materials. Convery said it would be mostly pre-cast with some stone and some tile on the roofs. Roberts asked about possible rooftop mechanical equipment and appropriate screening of it.

As this was the introductory presentation, nor formal action was requested nor received. The DRB members thanked the design team and asked them to return in April with Conceptual Design.

### **ENTRY RENOVATION AT STEARNS TOWER – CONSENT AGENDA APPROVAL**

Goodhew explained that a change in use is planned for the area on the ground floor of the Stearns Tower at Williams Village. The space was built as “Stearns Commons,” the dining hall for the tower. In recent years it has been used for conference and meeting rooms. It is proposed that the space become a “Grab & Go” fast food facility, a good use of the space which is adjacent to the main bus stop for Williams Village. The only change to the exterior is to build a small vestibule to provide an air-lock entry to the space. The entire vestibule would be under a canopy within the existing footprint. The door and new windows are intended to match the existing.

The Board agreed unanimously to allow the Office of Facilities Planning to coordinate any additional design with the project architects, Bennett Wagner Grody.

### **IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FOLSOM FIELD COMPLEX FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

Also present for the discussion were: Ken Cecil of J3 Engineering Consultants; Allyson Gutierrez, Gene Hodge, and Chris Knight of Mortensen Construction; Jeremy Krug, Scott Radecic, Michael Ray, and Brian Smith of Populous; Greg Dorolek of Wenk Associates; Emily Canova, Jason DePaepe, Tom McGann, and Gail Pederson of CU Intercollegiate Athletics; and Jessica Gammey and Mike Rable of CU Facilities Management.

Scott Radecic of Populous presented an overview of the project. The goal is to consolidate administrative and staff operations, and to provide a better experience for student athletes and fans. Also, the new concept will change the existing north and east side of the stadium into a new “front door.” There are three major components being proposed at this time: (1) major interior renovations to accommodate different programs in the Dal Wart Center, as well as new permanent seating facing the field, (2) a new Northeast Building containing new locker rooms, training facilities, coaches offices, and public amenities, as well as new seating curving from the existing seats towards Dal Ward, and (3) an indoor practice facility including an indoor football field, a 300 meter running track, and underground parking.

Brian Smith of Populous talked about site development. He showed maps of the context within the campus and the city. He noted that the site is adjacent to the important Boulder Creek corridor and its open spaces. Flooding and floodplain issues need to be addressed. This project will become a highly visible gateway to the campus and change a “backdoor” to a “front door.” With improvements suggested in the North of the Creek Framework Plan, Folsom Field will be more or less in the center of the main campus.

Ken Cecil of J3 Engineering said they want to “re-engage” with the riparian corridor of the creek and work within the new flood maps. While there may be extensive infrastructure improvements in the area, no buildings are proposed for the floor plan. Smith noted that there are significant variables in the topography of the site. The Facilities Operations Shops in the Stadium Building need access; the Grounds Building / Intermediate Processing Facility will need to be relocated; and service access to the entire complex needs to be accommodated. He noted that the weight room in the Northeast Building, and the indoor field need to be at the same elevation as the existing football field.

The existing Stadium Drive will be relocated closer to Boulder Creek (lining up with Taft Drive across Folsom Street). The new drive is envisioned as a divided boulevard and will have parking at the lower area leading up to a new circular drive at the entry plaza, then will continue up the hill past Dal Ward, essentially on the same right-of-way. A major new component of the site will be “Buff Walk,” a wide promenade going north-south between the Stadium Club Building and the new indoor practice facility. The outdoor football practice field will be relocated to the south half of the current Franklin Field. It will be fenced and gated with removable black mesh on the fencing for privacy. Buff Walk will be parallel to the existing service drive, which could become a pedestrian walk when the Facilities Shops are moved at some point in the future. fire access will be required; details are being worked out with the Boulder Fire Marshall.

Michael Ray of Populous showed design precedents which will influence the character of the new architecture. The new buildings will blend with Dal Ward and the Skybox structure and will respond to the architecture of the main campus with use of pink sandstone and red tile. Pre-cast will also be used. Massing studies were shown. A tower in the Northeast Building is proposed to help with “wayfinding.” Shade studies will be done as much of this is on the north side of existing structures.

Radecic went over details of the three components of the submittal. Dal Ward Center: The aluminum bleachers on the south side of the building would be replaced with permanent seating, and a balcony with seating would be extended from the upper level. This seating would serve a new “end zone club” where the weight room is now. As part of this project, the seating at the northwest corner of the stadium (which is built on an unstable hillside) would be removed and replaced by a new permanent curved section of seats. Northeast building: A new weight room and locker room would be on the lower levels. The upper levels would have coaches’ offices and a rooftop terrace. On the east side of the building would be new retail space and possibly a café along the Buff Walk. The weight room and locker rooms would connect to the practice facility under Buff Walk. Indoor practice facility: The facility would be used for track competitions and would have some spectator seating. The football practice field needs a 90 ft. height clearance. On the north end would be direct access to the outdoor practice field. To accommodate the 300 meter track, the north façade would have a curved pump out. Architecturally, the base of the building would be a pre-cast plinth similar to the Dal Ward Center.

Radecic showed some slides outlining the phasing of the construction for this project.

Brandes moved, seconded by Epstein, to approve both Concept and Schematic Design for the portion of the project dealing with the Dal Ward Center and the new northeast corner seating. The motion was approved 3-0.

#### COMMENTS

Epstein said he liked the “back to front” concept for the new building. He was concerned about views from the ground level as pedestrians and traffic moved up Folsom. He also noted that there would be an 800 ft. expanse along Folsom to Colorado that might need some softening. He told the team of an earlier master plan for the south side of the complex, part of which was put in place with the construction of the MCDB Plaza. He asked that it be followed along the Colorado Avenue side of the stadium. Noting that the outdoor practice field would be screened, he asked about night lighting and possible spillover. He was also concerned about lighting and safety along Boulder Creek. He asked about vertical circulation along the Buff Walk spine. He questioned whether there would be stairs, escalators, and interior access with elevators? He said there could be balcony elements as the stairs go up the hill over 30 feet from the bottom to the top levels; perhaps these steps could be heated and/or covered in spots. Roberts agreed with these concerns about ice and snow in the winter. Epstein also expressed some concern about the odd shape of the Northeast Building. He thought perhaps it should be entirely orthographical on the north and east sides, with curves only on the south and west sides.

Brandes congratulated the team on good progress with a complicated project. He noted that weekly working meetings, attended by some DRB members, were beneficial to the project. He wanted to make sure that the gateways to the complex be carefully designed to help promote not only the fan experience, but the student experience, both for student athletes and the general student population. This area should not appear to be “off-limits” to non-athletes.

Brandes also mentioned concern about access for maintenance, service, and emergencies. Other details to be addressed are drainage, signage, ADA considerations, and lighting. The south east corner of the stadium along Colorado Avenue needs to be carefully integrated, starting with the plan from the 1990s. He also would like to see exactly where the new fence will be around the outdoor practice field.

Roberts noted that the service elevator to the skyboxes addition is at the north; she asked what the implications are if the existing service road has to dead end? She asked if the proposed retail/café operations in the northeast building could be built so that some of the vertical movement could be inside, perhaps parallel to the outside steps but behind a glass wall. Epstein asked if there could be additional retail on the south side of the stadium as well. Roberts also asked about more daylighting into the indoor practice facility. She requested clarification of the bridge connecting Dal Ward to the northeast building. She also asked about a possible entry to the indoor practice facility from the southwest, primarily for spectators for track events.

Roberts said that the DRB wanted to go on record with their sentiment that if the indoor track were not part of the practice facility, the project would be much improved,

both architecturally and functionally. Epstein said that as presented, two elite programs would be bumping against each other. Brandes added that someone needs to make a decision on the structured parking and the indoor track.

## ARCHITECTURE

Epstein expressed that the team had done a good analysis of the architecture context of the project. He noted the “campus character” sketches in the packet, but asked to see more specifically how these themes related to the new buildings. He requested that the team examine the forms and massing of Macky Auditorium, which sits on the hillside with high visibility from downtown Boulder. Although the architecture is different from the Klaunder buildings, the massing is similar to the proposed indoor practice facility. He said that the bulge at the north end of the building to accommodate the track was a problem, but well done. He wanted to see more elevation drawings for all buildings. He noted that the foundation level of the practice facility changes as you go around the building and wondered if it could be more consistent. He also asked if a mezzanine in the weight room, which has very high ceilings, could be considered to help bring the scale down.

Epstein and Roberts agreed that there needs to be more 3-D models (whether physical or virtual) with views from the street level from various locations. Birds-eye views are helpful, but the appearance to actual passers-by is important. Roberts reminded the team that this building should not be designed only for the six days a year that there are home football games, but as a fully-integrated part of the campus. Although it is not part of this project, she would like to see at least an initial discussion of a future concourse connection, which would be on the north side of the Dal Ward Center. She also emphasized the importance of how the northeast building “turned the corner.” She asked Simpson to look at studies that have already been done of the future move of all Facilities Operations functions out of the Stadium Building; what would be the general time frame and cost?

Although formal action was neither required nor requested at the Conceptual Design stage, the Board expressed their endorsement of the three components of the project (Dal Ward, northeast building, and indoor practice facility), noting that Schematic Design had been approved earlier for the Dal Ward component and new northeast seating.